



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,910	12/16/2005	Takeshi Inaba	Q91600	6082
23373 7590 09/15/2008				
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC				
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
WOOD, ELLEN S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/560,910

Applicant(s)

INABA, TAKESHI

Examiner

ELLEN S. WOOD

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-824)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/12/2008; 03/17/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 1 and 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blasko et al. (US 6,776,195, hereinafter "Blasko").

In regards to claim 1, Blasko discloses an invention of two or more layer tubular polymeric laminates (col. 1 lines 13-12). The tubular polymeric laminate has an inner fluoropolymer layer (thermoplastic resin layer), an outer nylon layer (polyamide-based resin layer), and another resin layer (thermoplastic polymer layer) bonded directly to the fluopolymer layer (col. 3 lines 23-43). The preferred polyamide layer consists of nylon 6, 6/66, 11, 12, or 6/12 (col. 6 lines 41-43). These are also the preferred polyamide layers used by the instant applicant (pg. 13 lines 11-13). The thermoplastic resin is an ethylene based fluoropolymer (col. 6 lines 62-63), thus it would have a carbonyl

functional group. The thermoplastic polymer layer is a thermoplastic elastomer such as a polyurethane-based elastomer (col. 9 lines 1-2). The first layer (polyamide) is directly bonded to the second layer (fluoropolymer) through thermal "fusion" bonding (col. 5 lines 41-47 and 55-58).

In regards to claim 5, Blasko discloses that the additional resin layer is selected from a thermoplastic elastomer such as a thermoplastic polyurethane elastomer (col. 9 lines 1-2).

In regards to claim 6, Blasko discloses the preferred polyamide layer consists of nylon 6, 6/66, 11, 12, or 6/12 (col. 6 lines 41-43). These are also the preferred polyamide layers used by the instant applicant (pg. 13 lines 11-13). Thus, it is known to one ordinary skill in the art that the polyamide-based resin has an acid value of not higher than 80 (equivalents/10⁶ g).

In regards to claim 8, Blasko discloses that the thickness of the first layer (polyamide) has a thickness of between about 0.025-0.25 in (col. 5 lines 28-29) and the outermost layer (thermoplastic polymer layer) has a thickness of between about 0.02-0.15 in (col. 8 lines 61-62), thus the polyamide layer has a thickness not exceeding one fifth of the thickness of the thermoplastic polymer layer.

In regards to claim 10, Blasko discloses that the modified fluoropolymer materials are able to be fusion bonded, such as by co-extrusion, to additional layers at a temperature ranging between 150-280°C (col. 7 lines 20-25).

In regards to claims 11-12, Blasko discloses that a tube or hose is molded from the two or more layers that have been described (col. 11 lines 18-20).

In regards to claims 13-15, Blasko discloses the tubular polymeric laminate has an inner fluoropolymer layer (thermoplastic resin layer), an outer nylon layer (polyamide-based resin layer), and another resin layer (thermoplastic polymer layer) bonded directly to the fluoropolymer layer (col. 3 lines 23-43). The tube or hose will provide but chemical and environmental resistance from liquids such as fuel, organic, and inorganic solvents (col. 1 lines 21-29).

. Blasko is silent with regards to the amine value of the polyamide based resin, the modulus of elasticity in tension is lower than 400 MPa for the laminate and the total luminous transmittance.

Blasko discloses that the preferred polyamide layer consists of nylon 6, 6/66, 11, 12, or 6/12 (col. 6 lines 41-43). These are also the preferred polyamide layers used by the instant applicant (pg. 13 lines 11-13). The hoses and tubing formed from the polymeric compositions may be formed by co-extrusion without the use of an adhesive or tie layer (col. 3 lines 10-14). The advantages of the tubular composite structure are the enhanced resistance to internal and external chemicals and moisture (col. 3 lines 57-65). The specific nylon chosen are for reasons such as cost, service temperature, chemical compatibility with the fluid being handled, fluid, solvent, moisture or environmental resistance, flexural modulus, hardness, or other physical properties (col. 6 lines 43-50). Thus, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that it would be discovered by routine experimentation to find a polyamide resin composition with the amine value as claimed by applicant in order to improve the adhesion qualities when a tubular composite structure is formed through co-extrusion without the use of tie layers.

Blasko discloses that the nylon is chosen for the reasons of cost, chemical compatibility, flexural modulus, hardness, and other physical properties (col. 6 lines 39-50). Blasko discloses that to enhance the flexibility of the hose, the flexural modulus of the layers may be varied to have overall difference in flexibility (col. 9 lines 48-52). Thus, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the flexural modulus of the layers of Blasko to form a laminated resin molding that has a modulus of elasticity in tension of lower than 400 MPa.

Blasko forms a multilayer laminated resin molding that has an outermost layer of polyurethane, and intermediate layer of polyamide, and an innermost layer of fluoropolymer. Thus, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that the multilayer laminated resin molding would have a total luminous transmittance of not lower than 75%, because the structure is meant to be light shielding in order have exceptional resistance to chemical degradation and vapor permeation (col. 1 lines 21-22).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 5-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
5. Claims 2-4 have been cancelled.
6. The applicant argues that Blasko does not suggest the use of a polyamide-based resin having an amine value of 10 to 60 (equivalents/10⁶g). Blasko discloses that the preferred polyamide layer consists of nylon 6, 6/66, 11, 12, or 6/12 (col. 6 lines 41-43).

These are also the preferred polyamide layers used by the instant applicant (pg. 13 lines 11-13). The hoses and tubing formed from the polymeric compositions may be formed by co-extrusion without the use of an adhesive or tie layer (col. 3 lines 10-14). The advantages of the tubular composite structure are the enhanced resistance to internal and external chemicals and moisture (col. 3 lines 57-65). The specific nylon chosen are for reasons such as cost, service temperature, chemical compatibility with the fluid being handled, fluid, solvent, moisture or environmental resistance, flexural modulus, hardness, or other physical properties (col. 6 lines 43-50). The applicant states that the polyamide used for the ability to co-extrude a fluoropolymer material directly to a polyamide layer. Blasko discloses that the invention relates to directly bonding a layer of thermoplastic fluoropolymer material to a polyamide layer (col. 1 lines 12-19). Thus, it would be seen that by routine experimentation one would discover the optimal amine values of the polyamide based resin in order to successfully bond the thermoplastic fluoropolymer material to the polyamide layer.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELLEN S. WOOD whose telephone number is (571)270-3450. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ellen S Wood

Art Unit: 1794

Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/Carol Chaney/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794